

Remarks

In the Office Action of March 21, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 17, 23-26, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, 46-49, 52-55, 58 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0249801 to Kapur ("Kapur") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0234709 to Klavans et al. ("Klavans"); rejected claims 7 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kapur, Klavans, and the document "How to get a site listed in Google Glossary?" ("Maurer"); rejected claims 10-12, 32-34, 50 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Klavans, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0073541 to Lindblad et al. ("Lindblad"); rejected claims 18, 19, 40, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Klavans and U.S. Patent 6,922,809 to Coden et al. ("Codan"); and rejected claims 20-22, 42-44, 51, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Klavans and U.S. Patent No. 6,701,309 to Beeferman et al. ("Beeferman").

By this Amendment, Applicant proposes amending claims 1, 8, 9, 23, 30, 31, 33, 35, 46, and 47 to improve form.

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 17-26, 28-36, 39-44, 46-58, and 60 are currently pending.

*Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur and Klavans*

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 23-26, 28, 30, 31, 35-37, 39, 46-49, 52-55, 58 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kapur and Klavans. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

Amended claim 1, for example, is directed to a system for providing definitions. The system includes a server configured to receive a phrase to be processed and select a plurality of documents each containing at least one definition for the phrase. The system further includes a user interface configured to present one or more definitions for the phrase in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.

Neither Kapur nor Klavans, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests each of the features recited in amended claim 1. Neither Kapur nor Klavans, for example, discloses or suggests presenting one or more definitions for a phrase in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner points to paragraphs 0025 and 0176 of Kapur as being relevant to the “one or more definitions being presented in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.” (Office Action, page 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation Kapur. Neither these sections of Kapur, nor any other section of Kapur, discloses or suggests this feature of claim 1.

Paragraph 0025 of Kapur, for instance, states:

Referring to FIG. 2, according to one embodiment, server system 160 is configured to provide search result data and media content to client system 120, and server system 150 is configured to provide data and media content such as web pages to client system 120, for example, in response to links selected in search result pages provided by server system 160. As will be described in more detail below, server system 160 in one embodiment references various collection technologies for populating one or more indexes with, for example pages, links to pages, etc. Such collection technologies include automatic web crawlers, spiders, etc., as well as manual or semi-automatic classification algorithms and interfaces

for classifying and ranking web pages within a hierarchical structure. In certain aspects, server 160 is also configured with search related algorithms for processing and ranking web pages, such as for example, the PageRank algorithm from Google. Server 160 is also preferably configured to record user query activity in the form of query log files.

Although this section of Kapur discusses ranking web pages, ranking web pages and returning ranked web pages to a user is different than the features recited in claim 1. Ranking web pages does not disclose or suggest, as recited in claim 1, a user interface configured to present one or more definitions for a phrase in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions. As recited in claim 1, definitions are presented in an order based on the ranking of documents that contain the definitions. Kapur does not disclose or remotely suggest this feature.

Paragraph 0176 of Kapur is also not particularly relevant to “presenting one or more definitions ... in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents,” as recited in claim 1. This section of Kapur generally relates to functionality provided by a universal dialog box (UDB) interface provided by Kapur. For example, paragraph 0176 of Kapur, states, in describing Fig. 8:

The system locates the dictionary definition and provides it to the user as a separate web page. In this example, the system also performs a search for the argument and provides the results below the definition as shown.

(Kapur, paragraph 0176). As described by Kapur, the “web results” shown in Fig. 8 appears to be search results corresponding to a standard web search that is performed based on the terms for which the user is seeking a definition. The definition shown in Fig. 8 of Kapur, however, is not described as being presented in any particular order,

much less an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the definitions, as recited in claim 1.

Klavans, like Kapur, also fails to disclose or suggest one or more definitions being presented in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions, as recited in claim 1. Klavans, for instance, does not disclose ranking documents, much less presenting definitions in an order determined based on the ranking of documents that contain the definitions, as recited in claim 1.

Arguments similar to those presented above were made in the Amendment After Final filed on January 10, 2007. The Examiner did not address these arguments in the current Office Action. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner address these arguments or withdraw the rejection.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Kapur and Klavans, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 1, and accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 based on Kapur and Klavans should be withdrawn. The rejections of claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, and 17 based on Kapur and Klavans are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 1.

Independent claims 23 and 46 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kapur and Klavans. Claims 23 and 46 recite certain features similar to, although not necessarily identical in scope to, those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, based on rationale similar to that given above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 23 and 46 is also improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of

claims 24-26, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, and 40-44 based on Kapur and Klavans are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 23.

Independent claim 47 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kapur and Klavans. Claim 47 is directed to a system for determining definitions from distributed information stores. The system includes a search engine identifying a plurality of documents based on a search query including terms indicative of a presence of definitions, and storing information regarding each identified document. The system further includes a search front end matching a phrase for which a definition is sought against the stored information for each identified document, returning one or more matching definitions based on the matching of the phrase, and presenting each matching definition. The one or more definitions are presented in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.

Applicant submits that Kapur and Klavans, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in amended claim 47. In particular, neither Kapur nor Klavans discloses or suggests presenting definitions in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.

In rejecting claim 47, the Examiner particularly points to paragraphs 0025 and 0176 of Kapur as being relevant to this feature of claim 47. (Office Action, page 7). These sections of Kapur were discussed previously. Paragraph 0025 of Kapur, for instance, discusses ranking web pages. Ranking web pages and returning ranked web pages to a user, however, does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 47. Ranking web pages does not disclose or suggest, as recited in claim 47, for example,

presenting definitions in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.

Arguments similar to those presented above were made in the Amendment After Final filed on January 10, 2007. The Examiner did not address these arguments in the current Office Action. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner address these arguments or withdraw the rejection.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Kapur and Klavans, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 47. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 47 based on Kapur and Klavans is improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 48, 49, and 52 based on Kapur and Klavans are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 47.

Independent claims 53 and 60 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kapur and Klavans. Claims 53 and 60 recite certain features similar to, although not necessarily identical in scope to, those recited in claim 47. Accordingly, based on rationale similar to that given above with respect to claim 47, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 53 and 60 are also improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 54, 55, and 58 based on Kapur and Klavans are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 53.

*Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur and Klavans in view of Maurer*

Dependent claims 7 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur, Klavans, and Maurer. Applicant has reviewed Maurer and submits that Maurer

does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and

23. Applicant submits that at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claims 1 or 23, the rejection of claims 7 and 29 is improper and should be withdrawn.

*Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur, Klavans, and Lindblad*

Dependent claims 10-12, 32-34, 50, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur, Klavans and Lindblad. Applicant has reviewed Lindblad, and submits that Lindblad does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 23, 47, and 53. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 10-12, 32-34, 50, and 56 is improper and should be withdrawn.

*Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur, Klavans, and Coden*

Dependent claims 18, 19, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Klavans and further in view of Coden. Applicant has reviewed Coden, and submits that Coden does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 23. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 18, 19, 40, and 41 are improper and should be withdrawn.

*Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur, Klavans, and Beeferman*

Dependent claims 20-22, 42-44, 51, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Klavans and further in view of Beeferman. Applicant has

reviewed Beeferman, and submits that Beeferman does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 23, 47, and 53. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 20-22, 42-44, 51, and 57 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicant's silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or that such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry Snyder, L.L.P.

By: /Brian Ledell/

Brian Ledell

Reg. No. 42,784

Date: June 21, 2007

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Telephone: 571-432-0800
Facsimile: 571-432-0808